UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,418	09/05/2003	David J. Parins	1001.1675101	7562
	7590	EXAMINER		
1221 NICOLLE		HOEKSTRA, JEFFREY GERBEN		
SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55403-2420		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3736	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/656,418	PARINS, DAVID J.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JEFFREY G. HOEKSTRA	3736		

	JEFFRET G. HOEKSTKA	3730	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	, on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount on the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. $\square$ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consider because:  See Continuation Sheet.	ered but does NOT place the applic	cation in condition for	allowance
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Max Hindenburg/	/ loffwoy C Llaskatus /		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736	/Jeffrey G Hoekstra/ Examiner, Art Unit 3736		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues Johansen does not disclose for claim 10 the position of each of the plurality of joining elements is offset from the position of the each of the other plurality of joining elements other along the coil length in a direction transverse the longitudinal coil axis, for claim 28 at least one of the plurality of joining elements is disposed more distal than the others, or for claim 36 at least one of the plurality of joining elements is disposed closer to the proximal end than the others.

For claims 10 and 28, the Examiner notes Johanseon clearly shows in Figure 2 that each of the postiions of joining elements are longitudinally offset from each other, especially when viewed in the direction trasverse the longiduinal coil axis. The joining elements appear in Figure 2 to each begin and end about the the same wire of the coil that is helically twisted; however because of the pitch of the wire forming the helically disposed coil, there is at least a "longitudinal offset" between each of the positions of joining elements. For example, the position of the top joining element in Figure 2 is disposed most distally with respect to the position of the others, the position of the bottom joining element in Figure 2 is disposed most proximally with respect to position of the the others, and the position of the middle joining element in Figure 2 is longitudinally offset from the position of both the distal-most and proximal-most joining elements.

For claim 36, the Examiner reiterates as above and further notes there is no longitudinal overlap when viewed in a direction along the coil length.

Applicant substantively and separately argues claim 19, arguing Erickson does not remedy the deficiences of Johansen and does not teach at least one joining element does not couple to any of the two or more coil windings coupled by the at least one other joining element. The Examiner notes Erickson teaches a plurality of joining elements wherein at least one joining element that does not couple to any of the two or more coil widings coupled by the at least one other joining element. At least Figure 1 of Erickson clearly teaches joining adjacent windgins of a coil to each other at three distinct locations (about elements 32, 34, and 26) by welding, brazing, soldering, bonding agents, or last spot welding (column 5 line 56 - column 6 line 59).